



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Critical Notes

ASSYRIOLOGICAL NOTES

I

daurdu-taurtu, "minor, orphan (fatherless)"

Paragraph 28 of the new Assyrian Law Code (KAV, No. I, Col. IV, 1 f.), reads as follows: 1) [šum]-ma zinništu [al]-ma-at-tu a-na bît amêli 2) te-ta-ra-ab ù mâr-a-ša 3) 'da¹-ur-da il-te-ša na-ša-a-at 4) i-na bît a-ḫi-za-ni-ša ir-ti-bi 5) ù dup-pu ša-a mâr-ut-ti-šu la-a šaṭ-rat 6) zitta i-na bît mu-ra-bi-a-ni-šu 7) la-a i-laḫ-ki 8) ḫu-bu-ul-li la-a i-na-aš-ši 9) i-na bît a-li-da-ni-šu 10) zitta ki-i ḫa-ti-su i-laḫ-ki

"If a woman, who is a widow, enters into the house of a man, bringing her minor (orphaned) son with her, and he grows up in the house of her (new) husband: and (if) no document of adoption (sonship) has been written, he shall not receive a portion from the estate (house) of the one who brought him up. He bears no 'debt'; he shall receive a portion from the estate of his father (begetter), according to his share."

The word *daurdu-taurtu* has hitherto escaped recognition, probably because of its strange form. It occurs in two other passages, long since known. In V R, 23, 36 (= CT, xi, 36, Rev. 36) we find *TUR-DA* translated by *šer-ru*, *ši-iḫ-ru*, *la'-u*, *la-ku-u*, *ik-du*, *uk-ku-du*, *rid-di* (cf. *riḫu*), *ta-ūr-tu*, *tak-ši-ru*, *ba-an-du-u*. Now *ta-ūr-tu* has been misread *ti-šim-tu* in the past (Brünnow, 4137, and Delitzsch, *Sumerisches Glossar*, under *III banda*). But both the CT and the V R copies of the Syllabary have *ūr* and not *šim* for the second sign of the word. The other passage in which the word occurs is CT, xvi, 15, Col. V, 8 and 9. But here Thompson, undoubtedly misled by the mistake in Brünnow, copied the words as *ta-šim-tu*. *dam nu-tuk-meš du(TUR) nu-tu-ud-da-meš banda (TUR-DA) nu-un-zu-meš = aš-ša-tu ul aḫ-zu ma-ru ul al-du šu-nu ta-ūr-tu ul i-du-u*. The demons were a bad lot, "who did not take a wife, did not beget a son, did not regard (know) an orphan (minor)."

That *daurdu-taurtu* means something like "young child, minor" is clear from its context in the Code passage quoted above. This meaning of *šihru*, one of its synonyms (above), in the legal literature is too well known to call for further comment. Does it mean "orphaned, fatherless," like the Hebrew יתום? Is it a loanword from the Sumerian, a Semitic rendering of *TUR-DA*? Or is it related to *te-ir-du-u*, or *te-ir-di-en-nu* (II R, 30, 39 and 46)? I have no answer to these questions.

II

Ašmanu, "bachelor or widower (?)"

Speaking of widows and orphans: In an enumeration of certain Arbailuan families, KAV, No. 39, similar to the "census lists" published by Johns in *An Assyrian Doomsday Book*, the term *ašmanu* occurs a number of times. In lines 1-8 we find the names of the heads of families, together with an enumeration of those dependent upon them—wife, sons, daughters. Lines 9-11 contain the names of five men who are evidently without family. In each case the term *aš-ma-nu* follows the name. Are these men bachelors? From the legal documents we know that in ancient Babylonia, as in the modern Near East, the unmarried son, no matter what his age, remained in the father-house, or a brother's house, until a wife was provided for him. Or are these men whose wives are dead and whose sons and daughters have been married off? Finally, closing my eyes tight to § 64 of Delitzsch's *Assyrische Grammatik*, I raise the question: Is *ašmanu* a variant form of **almanu* (cf. late Hebrew אֶלְמָנָה), the masculine of *almattu*, "widow"?

III

ubtaeru, *uktainu*, presents, not preterites, of II 2

It is uttering a commonplace to say that the syntax of the Code of Hammurabi is very simple. *šumma awilum awilam ubbirma neirtam elišu iddima la uktinšu mubbiršu iddak*, "if a man prosecutes a man, and charges him with murder, but does not convict him, his prosecutor shall be put to death." More precisely: "If a man has prosecuted a man, has charged him with murder, but has not convicted him, his prosecutor shall be put to death." That is, *šumma* with the preterite of the verb states the case, or crime committed, and the conclusion, the penalty to be inflicted, is rendered by the verb in the present-future. That the new Assyrian Code exhibits the same syntactical structure as the Hammurabi Code is not surprising.

Now a number of the Assyrian laws begin "if a man (or a woman) does so-and-so (*šumma* with the preterite of the verb)" and continue "they shall prosecute him (or her), they shall convict him (or her),"—the Assyrian of the latter being *ubtaeruš*, *uktainuš*, or *ubtaerušī*, *uktainušī*. These forms should be present-futures. Scheil, *Recueil de Lois Assyriennes*, translates them as such, without any comment. On the other hand Lewy, *Das Verbum in den "Altassyrischen Gesetzen"*, classifies them as preterites of II 2 (p. 89); also, so far as I can see, without comment. Whether or not these scholars saw the difficulty involved I cannot say. But there is a difficulty. A form which one would unhesitatingly construe as a preterite because of its vocalization, is used where there is a syntactical demand for a present-future. In explanation let me call attention to the note on p. 283 of Delitzsch's *Assyrische Grammatik*, which in turn calls attention to V R, 45, where *present-futures*

only, of the 2nd pers. mas. sing. are listed. In Col. I, *tuḫtabal*, which begins the II 2 series, is followed by such forms as *tuḫtannib*, *tuḫtarrib*, etc. Delitzsch could not explain the presence of these forms, since he knew of no certain present-future forms, with *i* in the last syllable, in any connected text. The Assyrian Code has supplied this.

IV

naṭû and baḳānu

Paragraph 44 of the Assyrian Code (KAV, 1, Col. VI, 40 f. reads: *šum-ma amēlu aš-šu-ra-a-ia-u ù šum-ma zinništu aš-šu-ra-i-tu ša ki-i ša-par-te am-mar šim-šu i-na bīt amēli us-bu-u-ni a-na šīmi ga-me-ir la-ḫi-u-ni i-na-aṭ-ṭu i-ba-aḫ-ka-an uz-ni-šu u-ḫap-pa u-pal-la-aš*, "if an Assyrian man or if an Assyrian woman, who as a pledge, whatever its (?) value, is dwelling in the house of a man, (and) who is taken for the full price, he (the master of the house) shall come to an agreement (with him or her), his ears he shall bruise, shall pierce."

Lewy (*op. cit.*, 43) translates: "Wenn ein assyrischer Mann und wenn eine assyrische Frau (jemanden), der als Pfand, wieviel immer sein Preis, in dem Hause des Mannes[!] wohnt, zu vollem Preise übernommen ist, (ein)zeichnen, mit Marke (durch Scheeren) versehen will, so soll er seine Ohren zerstören, durchlochen." In a footnote he quotes a few of a great number of passages gathered by his teacher Ebeling, which show a meaning "einkratzen, (ein)zeichnen, tätowieren" for the root *naṭû*. It is unfortunate that he did not quote more extensively, for in only one of the four passages mentioned, namely, *BE*, VII, 1, 106, 9, is a meaning of this kind likely, and here, as in the other passages, the verb may be *nadû*, not *naṭû*. As to *baḳānu*: why did Lewy not give us some passages which show that it means "mark (by cutting the hair)"? Scheil (*op. cit.*, 60) translates these words: "(le) rase, coupe." Now I know of only one other passage, outside the Assyrian Code, where the two verbs are used together. This is a text in *BE*, XIV (No. 42), which I have discussed a number of times before (see *AJSL*, XXXI, 80). Let me give it in full: *dup-pi ri-ki-iš-ti ša in-na-an-nu a-na amē-rikḫēpl ù KA-ZID-DA ir-ku-su kurunnu (KAŠ-SAG) ul ta-am-ma akālu (GAR) ul ba-ni-ma i-na-ba-lu mrabā-ša-nergal akālu šikaru(KAŠ) ù me-ri-iš-tum i-nam-di-in-ma i-na-du-u i-ba-ka-nu nap-ḫa-ar ši-ka-ri ša iš-tu arabarahšamna ša šatti Ikam a-na ka-ab-ri i-ka-na-ak*. (Date, Airu of year two, and seals of the *rikḫe* and *KAZIDDA*). This text, I now believe, should be translated: "the contract (tablet) which Inannu drew up with the brewers and miller. 'If the wine is not good, and the bread (food) is not clean, they shall destroy (them). Rabā-ša-Nergal shall (thereupon) give food (bread), wine and *merištum*, and they (the brewers and the miller) shall come to an agreement (with him about it). All of the wine which (comes) from the month Arahšamna of the year one, he shall seal for the cup (that is, pass as good).'" Now, whatever objections may be raised to my translation, no one, I am sure, will venture to suggest meanings such as are given by Scheil and Lewy for

i-na-du-u and *i-ba-ka-nu*. The subject is plural (the *rikkê* and *KAZIDDA*), and the object, if there is any, should surely be the wine and bread. But one does not shave, shear, nor tattoo these commodities. That there is some connection between the verb *bakânu* and the *buânu*-ceremony of the real-estate and slave sales of the early Babylonian documents, is, I believe, certain. (I had twice published this guess, before reading Jastrow's marvelous philological discussion of this and other points in *JAOS*, XLI, 41, and elsewhere.)

Lewy's whole translation is forced. Why should there be any mention of the fact that one of the parties concerned was an *Assyrian* man, or an *Assyrian* woman, if this party was not the one who was to be reduced to servitude through the piercing of the ears? The obvious parallelism of this paragraph of the Code and Exod. 21:2 f., was seen by Jastrow.

Now *naû*, as its Sumerian equivalent *ag* clearly indicates, means "to make, to do." Its secondary meaning, "to be possible, to be proper," is easily derived from the primary meaning. Things that are "done" are even yet "proper." The simple translation "to make" will fit all of the passages Lewy quotes for a meaning "einkratzen," etc. As to a meaning "to cut the hair, to shear," for *bakânu*: there is but one passage known to me where such a translation would fit. In *BE*, XIV, 128, 8 f., we read: *šipātu bu-ku-nu ša i-na šatti SAG-NAM-LUGAL-LA i-na al-tukulti-ê-kur^{ki} i-na araš-simanu šatti I^{kam} hi-i-da*. "Wool, *buḫunu*, which in the year of accession (was gathered, bought?), in Tukulti-Ekur, in Simanu of the year one, was (is) given over (to the men whose names follow in the document). Perhaps *buḫunu* has the same meaning here as *buḫumu*, but it is not certain. In any case, *bakânu* is not the word used for cutting the hair of persons. That term is always, so far as my observation goes, *galâbu*.

naû and *bakânu*, I believe, mean "to do," or "be agreeable about, a thing," and "to close the deal." Perhaps "to come to a satisfactory agreement" would be a sufficient rendering of the two. This meaning fits the other passage in the Code, § 58 (*KAV*, 1, Col. VIII, 60 f., where the two words were probably used together. The paragraph, with my restorations follows: *uš-šir hi-ta-a-ni ša aššat(at) amêli*) *ša i-na dup-pi [šaṭ-ru-u-ni] amêlu aššat-su [i-na-at-ṭu] i-ba-ka-an 'uz-ni-ša* *u-ḥap-pa u-'pal-la-aš* *a-ra-an-šu la-aš-[šu]*. Let me give the two preceding paragraphs in connection with my translation of § 58. (§ 56) "Whether there is striking or [(unlawful) seizure] 'of the wife' of a man, 'that which is written' in the 'tablet'" (is to be enforced). (§ 57) "In (the case) of every crime [for which there is the penalty] of cutting off [of the ears, or nose], or ruining of the 'condition (reputation?)' as it is [written]" (it shall be carried out). (§ 58) "Except (in case) of the crime [(involving) the wife of a man], which is [written] in the tablet: the man may come to an understanding with his wife, he shall bruise and 'pierce' her ears.¹ There is no penalty for his so doing."

In a number of paragraphs in the Code where a wife's unfaithfulness is under discussion, the penalty of death may be commuted by the husband to

cutting off her nose (§ 15) or her ears (§§ 4 f., for theft, and probably § 24). I take it this *piercing* of the ears is a further commutation.

V

Was there a god Zababa?

The reading *Zababa* for ^dZA-MAL-MAL, supposedly rendered certain, or at least extremely probable, by line 220 of the Chicago Syllabary, is being generally accepted by Assyriologists in spite of vigorous protests from the writer (*AJSL*, XXXV, 55 f.). To my knowledge only two scholars have attempted to adduce evidence other than that of the Chicago Syllabary in support of such a reading; Professor Clay in a brief note in *JAOS*, XXXVII, 328 f., and more recently, Professor Ungnad (*OLZ*, 1922, 202 f.). I wish these scholars would explain two passages in the "Götterliste" published by Schroeder in *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, verschiedenen Inhalts*. I refer to No. 46, Obv. 6-9 and No. 63, Col. I, 40-43. The first runs:

- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| 6) [za-mal-mal/gal] | | ^d ZA-MAL-MAL | | "za-a-u pi-sa-an min-na-bi | | [^d] |
| 7) il-ba | | ^d MAL | | "pi-sa-an-nu | | ^d |
| 8) al-ba | | ^d MAL | | "pi-sa-an-nu | | ^d ša-maš |
| 9) il-ba-ba | | ^d ZA-MAL-MAL | | "za-a-u pi-sa-an min-na-bi | | ^d nin-šig |

and the second:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 40) [^d ZA-MAL-MAL | | [^d nergal(?) ¹ |
| 41) [^d] MAL | | [^d il]-ba |
| 42) [^d] MAL | | [^d al]-ba |
| 43) [^d ZA-MAL-MAL | | [^d nin]-šig |

Now, if *ilba*, *alba*, and *ilbaba* really give the pronunciation of the ideograms which follow, and this would probably be denied by no one (in view of such passages as *CT*, XXV, 27, 16, and *KAV*, 64, Col. III, 14, and others), then it would seem difficult to regard the beginning of line 6 of the first passage quoted, as giving anything other than a pronunciation of ^dZA-MAL-MAL. Of course my restoration is not absolutely certain, but I see no other possibility. But as to the meaning of the *gal* there can be no doubt. It can only be the dialectical (Sumerian) variant of the preceding *mal*. Schroeder, *Orientalistische Studien*, Fritz Hommel . . . gewidmet, I, 179 f., saw this. The Assyrian scribe may not have known as much Sumerian as we do today (or think we do), but he certainly knew of a pronunciation *Zamalmal*, with a variant *Zagalgal* for the name he wrote ^dZA-MAL-MAL. Unfortunately, there must remain doubt as to the Semitic (if I may put it that way) god with whom he wished to identify this Sumerian deity. Schroeder, *op. cit.*, 180, thinks it was ^dMAŠ, or *Ninib*, in view of *CT*, XXV, 12, 25, but the traces in line 40 of the second passage quoted above seem to point to the ideogram usually used to designate the name of the god Nergal. Another possibility is ^dIM (= Adad).

I do not mean to say that we are to pronounce ^dZA-MAL-MAL as *Zamalmal* or *Zagalgal* every time we run across this ideogram (for such it had become). Indeed I fail to see how anyone who has ever spent an hour with the lists in *CT*, XXIV and XXV can speak of the pronunciation of such ideograms as ^dZA-MAL-MAL, ^dNIN-IB or ^dMAŠ. Line 6 of the first passage quoted above gives a pronunciation *Zamalmal* (var. *Zagalgal*), while line 9 gives another, *Ilbaba*. But there is no evidence for *Zababa*. Nor can I follow Weidner when he speaks of the prominent part the god *Zababa* (he too accepts this pronunciation) plays in the documents from Boghaz-keui (*Boghazköi-Studien*, 6, 97), for the chances are that the writing ^dZA-MAL-MAL was used ideographically to render some "Hittite" god's name. So we find the name of the god Teshub written ^dIM or ^dU, to both of which writings the phonetic complement *ub* is often added. The Egyptian scribes used the name Sutekh for this and other Asiatic gods.

VI

Urta, one of the many gods identified with Ninib

In *Old Testament Studies in Memory of William R. Harper*, I, 287 f., Professor Clay published the Aramaic version of certain Babylonian names found on some Nippur documents. Here ^dMAŠ was rendered in the Aramaic by אֲנִישָׁת. Professor Clay and others at once concluded that the long-sought-for pronunciation of the name ^dNIN-IB had been discovered. A fair-sized literature had sprung up on the subject when another discovery was made. The Yale Syllabary, No. 53 of Clay, *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Babylonian Collection* (1915), gave a new equivalent of ^dNIN-IB (l. 228). On the basis of this text it was proposed to read the name ^dNin-urta. In a note in *AJSL*, XXXV (1918), 55 f., I entered a protest against this interpretation, and suggested that, since the beginning of the line under consideration was slightly damaged, it was possible that instead of *ur-ta* the text had *kab-ta*. I argued that, whatever the reading, neither this Syllabary nor the Nippur "endorsements" gave us any pronunciation of the ideogram (if it be one) ^dNIN-IB, but that the Yale text added another name to the long list of gods identified with ^dNIN-IB, while the Aramaic characters gave us the name of a god which appeared in cuneiform as ^dMAŠ.¹ My protest fell on deaf ears, for I find that scholars generally have adopted the rendering *Ninurta* for ^dNIN-IB.

Now at the risk of appearing to belong to the stiff-necked, "Missourian" faction of humanity, I venture to reopen the discussion. I do so in view of

¹ In *OLZ*, XX (1917), 1 f., which I had, of course, not seen when my note was written, Ungnad used practically the same passages from the different syllabaries which I had used, but came to the conclusion that they proved that *Ninurta* (*Nimurta*) was the reading of ^dNIN-IB. That the ideogram ^dMAŠ represented a name, in Assyrian, ending in *t(u)* follows from the hypocoristic ^dMAŠ-ti-i, cf. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names*, under *NINIB*.

the fact that a parallel text to the Yale Syllabary has appeared, namely, *CT*, XXXV, plates 1-8. Let me set down the relevant sections of these two syllabaries and in addition some lines from another, published by Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts* (1914), No. 104, iv. 6 f.

Yale, 286:	<i>ib</i>	<i>IB</i>	<i>u-ra-šu</i>	<i>tu-bu-uk-tu</i>
" 287:	<i>da-ra</i>	<i>IB</i>	"	<i>is-ḫu, ni-bit-tu</i>
" 288:	<i>ur-ta</i>	<i>IB</i>	"	<i>ša ^aNIN-IB šu-ma</i>
" 289:	<i>u-ra-aš</i>	<i>IB</i>	"	<i>pi-riš-ti</i>
<i>CT</i> , XXXV, 8, 38:	<i>i-ib</i>	<i>IB</i>		<i>tu-bu-uk-tu</i>
" 39:	<i>da-ra</i>	<i>IB</i>		<i>is-ḫu, ni-bit-tu</i>
" 40:	<i>ur-ta</i>	<i>IB</i>		<i>ša ur-ta ^aNIN-IB</i>
" 41:	<i>u-ra-aš</i>	<i>IB</i>		<i>pi-riš-tu</i>
Poebel, 6:	[<i>ib</i>	<i>IB</i>		<i>t u-bu-uk-tum</i>
" 7:	[<i>da-ra</i>	<i>IB</i>]		<i>is-ri</i> (error)
" 8:	[<i>ur-ta</i>	<i>IB</i>]		<i>ša ^aNIN-IB šu</i> (did <i>ma</i> follow?)
" 9:	[<i>u-ra-aš</i>	<i>IB</i>]		<i>^aNIN-IB</i>
" 10:	[<i>u-ra-aš</i>	<i>IB</i>]		<i>pi-ri-iš-tum</i>

The restorations in the Poebel texts are reasonably certain as will appear from what follows.

The new *CT* text makes *ur-ta* certain, and my suggested *kab-ta* goes by the board. But it also makes the reading *Ninurta* less probable if not impossible. I am sure that if we had this text only, it would not occur to anyone to make *ur-ta* the rendering of the second syllable of ^a*NIN-IB*, but that the line would be interpreted as "*ur-ta*, (the reading of) *IB*, (which is) *Urta*, (to be identified with) ^a*NIN-IB*."¹

For the identification of ^a*IB* with ^a*NIN-IB*, cf. *CT*, XXIV, 40, 61, ^a*IB* ditto (= ^a*NIN-IB*) *ša al-li* and *CT*, XXV, 11, 25,

^a*IB* (glossed *u-ra-aš*) ditto (= ^a*NIN-IB*) *ša ud da-ni-e*

From these examples we see that ^a*IB* was equated with ^a*NIN-IB*, and from the second of them, that *one* pronunciation of ^a*IB* was *uraš*.² Now it is fairly certain that the Poebel text had *uraš*=*IB*=^a*NIN-IB* in line 9. And one may reasonably conclude that line 8 had *ur-ta*. The *ur-ta* here as well as in the Yale Syllabary and *CT* text is merely another pronunciation of *IB* when used to write a god's name. *Urta* is, therefore, only another name to be added to the sixty-odd gods identified by the late Babylonian scribes with the god whose name was written ^a*NIN-IB*.

[While this note was being set up, Part III of *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* reached me. No. 74 of this volume is a fragment of a letter from Duthalia, one of the Hittite kings, to another king whom we recognize at once as the well-known Assyrian king Tukulti-NINIB, who reigned about 1250 B.C. The fragment begins

[*um-ma*] ^a*šamši* (*ši*) *m|u-ut-ḫa-li-ia* [*šarru rabā*, etc.]

[*a-na*] *m|du-ku-ul-tu-^aIB* *šarru* (remainder broken away)

¹ See preceding critical note, p. 60.

For other identifications made by the Babylonian scribes see Deimel, *Pantheon*, 143.

Now the writing of the name of the Assyrian king seems to me to settle the problem under discussion. We must read Tukulti-urta, or Tukulti-urash, but not Tukulti-enurta, or the like. Since the name of this king is written both Tukulti-^dNIN-IB and Tukulti-^dMAŠ, the reading Tukulti-urta is to be preferred. For we have already called attention to the hypocoristic ^dMAŠ-ti-i (note 1, p. 61). And with *urta* established as the reading of NIN-IB=IB (and probably = MAŠ) in *Assyrian* names, it is not improbable that we should add to the NINIB-hypocoristics such names as Urdâ, Urdî, and perhaps Urdu and Urdi (of Tallqvist, *op. cit.*)

That Professor Clay should connect *Ninurta*, or *Enurta*, with *Amurru*, was to be expected. But I was somewhat surprised to find Schroeder reading ^dMAŠ-apal-Ê-kur as ^dNinurta-apal-Ê-kur (*Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, verschiedenen Inhalts*, Index, xxii), when a parallel text (10, a 7) had SAK-KAL-apal-Ê-kur. It seems to me that this variant suggests that the name of the Assyrian god which was usually written ^dMAŠ or ^dNIN-IB might also have been pronounced *Sakkal* or *Šaggal*. Cf. ^dSAK-KAL, CT, XXIV, 47, 18; ^dSAG-GAL, CT, XXV, 22, 40 and 23, 7a; also the personal names *Bûr-d* *Sa-gal-e* (in whose eponym occurred the eclipse of the sun which fixed the chronology of the late Assyrian period for us) and *Tab-sa-gal*, in Tallqvist, *op. cit.* But this point is not to be pressed.

I may add that I was somewhat puzzled by the absence of ^dMAŠ and ^dNIN-IB compounds in the personal names found in the recently published Cappadocian texts of the British Museum and the Louvre, especially since the names are in all respects similar to those found in the early Assyrian inscriptions. And then I remembered that I had failed to find a ^dMAŠ or ^dNIN-IB compound in any Assyrian text before the time of Tukulti-NINIB. What is the explanation?

VII

On some "Hittite" Proper Names

In preparing the translations of the texts found in *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, I, for my "Hittite Treaties and Letters," *AJSL*, XXXVII, 161 f., I made a large number of identifications of proper names found in these documents with names found in other cuneiform and hieroglyphic texts. Many of these identifications were so obvious that I did not think it worth while to call attention to them in the foot-notes. Others were classed as less obvious or even doubtful. A few of the less obvious ones were noted, so for example, *Alše* and *Tegarama* (or *Tagarama*), which appear in the later Assyrian texts as *Alsi* and *Tilgarimmu*. I hoped to make a more thorough study of these names in a separate article, and therefore refrained from suggesting any identifications which I regarded as doubtful. The steady progress which is being made in the publication of the Boghaz-keui documents now makes the postponement of such a study advisable. But since I find so keen a student as Weidner

failing to make an identification which I regarded as too obvious for comment, it would seem not amiss to put down a few random notes on these names.

Weidner, *Boghazköi-Studien*, 6, 77, n.) equates *bar-saglapani* (*KBo.* I, No. 4, IV, 28) with *bar-sagⁿiplani*, which occurs many times in these texts. Now Mount Niblani (as I prefer to transliterate) may well be the modern Nimrūd Dagh, as Weidner suggests, but Mount Lablani is clearly Mount Lebanon (usually written *Labnana* in the cuneiform): the name which follows, namely Mount Shariana, that is Sirion, the Sidonian name for Hermon (Deut. 3:9), makes this identification certain.

A comparison of the passages in the Boghaz-keui texts in which are mentioned the gods who are called upon as witnesses of the treaties (*KBo.* I, No. 1, Rev. 35 f., No. 2, Rev. 18 f., No. 3, Rev. 1 f., 23 f., and No. 4, Rev. Col. IV, 1 f.) with a similar section of the hieroglyphic version of the treaty between Ramses II and Hattushili of Hatti, makes possible many obvious, and some less obvious, identifications (cf. Breasted, *Ancient Records*, III, § 386).

"The Sun-god[dess] of the city of Ernen (ʔ-r-n-ʔ)" is clearly the same as "Shamash (goddess) of Arinna." (For Arinna, cf. *AJSL*, XXVIII, 162.) "Sutekh of the city of Aleppo (Ḫy-r-ʔ-p)" is "Teshub of Ḫalab (or Ḫalpa)," and "Sutekh of the city of Rekhšen (R-ḫ-ʔ-sy-n)" whose name follows that of Sutekh of Aleppo, is clearly the same as "Teshub of Liḫzina" whose name likewise follows that of Teshub of Ḫalab. Three other names which follow one another in the cuneiform *KBo.* I, No. 1, Rev. 44, Zithariaš, Karziš, Ḫapanta— (name not complete. Perhaps to be restored, on the basis of the Egyptian, Ḫa-pa-an-ta-[ar]-ʔa-ʔaš) seem to be given in the same order in the hieroglyphic as Zeyethekrer (Dʔy-yʔ-t-ḫy-r-ry), Kerzet— (Kʔ-r-dʔy-t—) and Kherpenteres (Ḫ-r-ʔ-n-ty-ry-sʔ). So "Sutekh of the city of Khesešep (Ḫy-sʔ-sʔ-p)" seems to me to be identical with "Teshub of Hiššašḫapa."

Less obvious, or even doubtful, is the identification of "Teshub of Betiarik" with "Sutekh of the city of Perek (Pʔy-r-ʔ-k)," or of "Išhara, lady of the oath," with "the mistress of swearing, Teskher (Tʔ-sʔ-ḫ-r)," or of Ištar with "Antheret (ʔn-t-rʔ-ty)," perhaps to be corrected to "Astarte (ʔ-s-ty-rʔ-t)," cf. *BAR*, IV, § 105.

Kezwenden is, of course, Kissuadni. (Wherever I transcribed Kissulani, which was done after a long struggle, I should now without hesitation read Kissuadni.)

Ḫode, the name of a land, frequently mentioned in the Egyptian documents, I have long been looking for in the cuneiform. I believe I have now located it in the oft-occurring name Uda (Uta) of the Boghaz-keui texts. Ḫode is mentioned between Carchemish and Kadesh in a Ramses II text (*BAR*, III, § 306. Cf. also *BAR*, III, § 309, where we find it in the series, Kezwenden, Carchemish, Ekereth, Ḫode, Nuges, Mesheneth and Kadesh). In *KBo.* I, No. 1, Rev. 46, Uda is mentioned between Aleppo and Kissuadni—a south-north series, as over against the north-south series of the Egyptian texts. As to the spelling: For Egyptian *k* used to transcribe

Semitic ד , ג or ג , cf. Erman, *ÄG*, 3d ed., § 116. Cf. also the modern Arabic pronunciation of the name of Jerusalem, Udes (Udes) for Kudes , and the Aramaic אֲרָמָא , אֲרָמָא .

In like manner Egyptian *g* frequently represents Semitic ג or ג . This has given me the clue to another identification (not proposed here for the first time, see *BAR*, II, p. 187, note 1.), namely Nuges with Nuḥašše (the *h* of the cuneiform transcribing an ג , ג). It has already been suggested that Nuḥašše is the same as the נֶחֱשֶׁה of the ZKR-Inscription. Cf. Weidner, *op. cit.*, 77, n., and Dhorme, *Rev. bibl.*, 1908, 503. For the location of Nuhašše see *BAR*, III, § 309.

Duddul, *KBo.* I, No. 10, Obv. 42 (which appears as Duldul in my translation, *AJSL*, XXXVII, 201, through a typographical error), is obviously the Tutul of the Hammurabi Code, Col. IV, 30. Here the people of Mera (= Mari) and Tutul are mentioned.

Finally, in *KBo.* I, No. 1, Rev. 43, I should like to restore "Teshub of [Bam]biki." Bambyke is mentioned in a text in Johns, *ADD*, No. 773 (= K 180), l. 5.

D. D. LUCKENBILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A MESSENGER FROM IBLA

Our interest in the western Semites who wandered into the plain of Shinar, singly or collectively, has steadily increased since the time that Ranke called our attention to them in his *Personal Names*. With the publication of Poebel's *Historical Texts* a number of geographical terms gained new significance. The elder Sargon, according to his own inscriptions, extended his conquests westward over Mari, Yarmuti, and Ibla to the Cedar Forest and the Silver Mountain. We know that Naram-Sin called himself conqueror of "Armanu and Ibla" (*RA*, Vol. X, p. 101, No. 1). My immediate interest is in certain citizens of Ibla. In the time of the Ur dynasty we begin to meet with individuals from this western city (country). Sometimes we have their names, sometimes not; so we hear of Ili-Dagan, the man of Ibla (Legrain, *Le temps des rois d'Ur*, p. 120), or again simply of a man of Ibla (Contenau, *Umma sous la dynastie d'Ur*, No. 27). While in Diwaniyah the other winter, I was able to make a few hasty notes of some cuneiform documents in the possession of the political officer of that district, Major (I hope he is at least a colonel by this time) C. K. Daly. One of these was a tablet dated in the forty-fourth year of Dungi (*mu ki-maš^{ki} u ġu-mur-ti^{ki} ba-ġul*). It had to do with offerings of "firstlings" of the flocks to different deities: 1 *silā* ^d*En-lil*, 1 *silā* ^d*Nin-lil*, *mu-du En-^dNinni*, 1 *silā* ^d*En-lil*, etc., 1 *maš* (?) *nitaġ*, 5 *udu nitaġ*, *Su-ri-im*, ^u*kin-gé-a* ^u*Ib-la^{ki}*, "One lamb for Enlil, one lamb for Ninlil, En-Ninni brought. One lamb for Enlil, etc., one fat kid (and) five fat sheep (were brought) by Surim, the